5th February 1925]

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" May I know what that order is, its number and date, etc. ? "

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—" I would be pleased to give my hon. Friend a copy of it, Sir, if he wishes. I believe it has not been published."

Inquiry regarding assessment of backyard cultivation.

* 119 Q.—Mr. P. PEDDIRAJU : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state whether the inquiry commenced in 1917 regarding the assessment of backyard cultivation has been finished and whether the Government have arrived at any decision in the matter and, if so, whether the Government will lay the papers on the table ?

A.—Presumably the hon. Member refers to the undertaking given by Sir Alexander Cardew in the discussion on a resolution moved by the hon. Mr. K. Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar in November 1917. If so, the hon. Member is referred to G.O. No. 3075, Revenue, dated 27th August 1918, which was placed on the Editors' Table.

Survey.

Holding of Survey Special Test Examination in Malabar.

* 120 Q.—Mr. R. VEERIAN : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that a public hall was rented at Manjeri in order to hold the Special Test Examination of the Survey Department in Malabar in 1924 ;

(b) whether the examination was held either on the 27th or 28th November 1924 in the rented hall for the purpose or in a private house belonging to one of the candidates who sat for the said examination on the 29th November 1924 ;

(c) if the examination was held on the 29th November 1924 in the private house of one of the candidates who sat for the examination, the reason for so doing ;

(d) who the Superintendents of the examination were ;

(e) whether there was any re-examination of the Survey Special Test Examination in Malabar in any of the years from 1918 onwards and, if so, the reason for it, and who was responsible for it ; and

(f) how many persons applied for the examination held in 1924 and how many were selected and to what communities the selected men belong ?

A.—(a) to (f) The Government have no information.

Mr. R. VEERIAN :—" With reference to clause (b) my information is that the examination was held in a private house of one of the candidates who sat for the examination, though there was a rented hall for the purpose. Now, I ask, Sir, what was the necessity for holding the examination in a private house ? I consider that it is against public policy to do so. Therefore, I want to know whether the Government are not going to call for the information and place it on the Council table."

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—" I am afraid, Sir, the matter does not appear to be of sufficient importance."

[5th February 1925

Mr. R. VEERIAN :—"Am I to take it, Sir, that this is a very trivial matter and that the Government do not call for the information for that reason? Is this a very trivial matter, Sir, the holding of a public examination in a private hall?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Member for the Government having said that he does not consider the matter to be of sufficient importance, it is not necessary for the hon. Member to press the matter now. He may return to it in some other way if he likes."

Local Boards and Municipal Councils.

Election of the Chairman of the Dindigul Municipality.

*121 Q.—Mr. V. HAMID SULTAN MARAKKAYAR : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state —

(a) whether it is a fact that the Vice-Chairman, Dindigul Municipal Council, reported to the Government about the misbehaviour of certain councillors (which is said to have been the reason for the withdrawal of the elective privilege) about the close of March 1924 and again on 19th May 1924 and again on 23rd May 1924 about the tumultuous behaviour of certain councillors on 21st May 1924, i.e., during the time of the Chairman's election;

(b) whether he requested the Government to depute the Inspector of Municipalities to hold an enquiry into the affair;

(c) if the answer to items (a) and (b) be in the affirmative, what orders were passed thereon;

(d) whether the Subdivisional Magistrate had not issued on 21st May 1924 an order under 144, Criminal Procedure Code, in his magisterial capacity prohibiting all persons except the councillors in the meeting hall and whether Mr. C. Ponnuswami Nayudu alone was allowed as an exception;

(e) whether the Vice-Chairman has not in the reports made mention that the presence of Mr. C. Ponnuswami Nayudu in the meeting hall at the time of certain meetings mainly contributed to the misbehaviour of the councillors;

(f) whether it is a fact that the Subdivisional Magistrate held an enquiry as to whether Mr. Angamuthu Pillai was an elected councillor and, if the answer be in the affirmative, the provision of law under which he held this enquiry;

(g) whether it is not a fact that the Government directed about 10th June 1924 that either Mr. Muhammad Meera Sahib or Mr. R. Ramaswami Nayudu should establish their claim to the Chairmanship through a court of law;

(h) whether it is a fact that Muhammad Meera Sahib had accordingly filed a declaratory suit in the Sub-Court which is still pending and that a temporary injunction was granted to him restraining Mr. R. Ramaswami Nayudu from interfering with the duties of Chairman;

(i) whether it is a fact that the Vice-Chairman sent on 21st May 1924 a notification under the rules, for publication in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, declaring Muhammad Meera Sahib as elected Chairman and, if the answer be in the affirmative, why it was withheld;